

Examiners' Report  
June 2014

GCSE History B 5HB03 3A

## Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at [www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com) or [www.btec.co.uk](http://www.btec.co.uk).

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at [www.edexcel.com/contactus](http://www.edexcel.com/contactus).



### Giving you insight to inform next steps

ResultsPlus is Pearson's free online service giving instant and detailed analysis of your students' exam results.

- See students' scores for every exam question.
- Understand how your students' performance compares with class and national averages.
- Identify potential topics, skills and types of question where students may need to develop their learning further.

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit [www.edexcel.com/resultsplus](http://www.edexcel.com/resultsplus). Your exams officer will be able to set up your ResultsPlus account in minutes via Edexcel Online.

### Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: [www.pearson.com/uk](http://www.pearson.com/uk).

June 2014

Publications Code UG039146

All the material in this publication is copyright  
© Pearson Education Ltd 2014

## Introduction

This was the ninth series of this specification and is one of four similar Source Enquiries. Each follows a similar pattern. The structure of the paper and the mark scheme remain unchanged. Generally all that changes is the context provided by the evidence used and the particular focus of the questions provided. This series the paper focused on the development of anaesthetics in surgery and whether religious beliefs were the main reason why there was so much opposition to the use of anaesthetics. The paper was broadly comparable to other units and was sat once again by more candidates than the other three units 3B, 3C and 3D put together. The paper performed well and there is evidence that most candidates were able to demonstrate positive achievement on all questions. Questions 3 and 5 posed some issues for some candidates especially Question 5, where many candidates found difficulty in reaching the highest level of the mark scheme. Other questions were straightforward and should have presented few problems for well-prepared candidates. Some of the work seen was exceptionally good. The most challenging question was Question 5 but here there was less evidence than in the previous series of candidates failing to at least tackle this question. The failure to produce a response on this last question on the paper means the loss of 19 potential marks. The use of own knowledge in Question 5 was as in previous series a problem to accessing the higher marks in Level 3 and all of Level 4. Many who just made use of the sources provided, were unable to proceed beyond Level 3 and 10 marks. However, few candidates scored very low marks on the paper. Evidence-based skills and use of sources was often better deployed than the candidates' own knowledge of the topic and subject area. In terms of utility questions there are still a significant number of candidates who produce simplistic learnt responses such as primary sources are more accurate and reliable and therefore of more use than secondary ones. Some candidates still believe that historians of a later date are often simply out to make money, are prone to exaggerate and are unreliable.

## **Question 1**

Question 1, on the whole, was answered quite well. There were very many students who achieved Level 3 range by building their observations on one another, such as noting there were no anaesthetics, so the patient was in great pain, so therefore the surgeon must go at top speed, but therefore accidents happened etc. The problems of both pain and blood loss were noted by a great majority of students and were discussed well.

The greatest issue on Question 1 was students attempting to work hygiene and infection into their answers. There were a number of students who said that the source tells us that the death of the assistant who lost fingers in particular had died due to infection, which whilst probably true cannot be inferred from the source.

Many other students, including those who got the highest marks for other observations, nonetheless described Liston as 'careless', or 'incompetent', or 'improperly trained' etc. This was the answer that saw the greatest amount of 21st century anachronisms by far, complaining about Liston managing to conduct an operation where two people died, without any 'proper safeguards' (for example). It should be emphasised to students that what happens in hospitals today is not relevant to discussion of the past in this context. Many students did say that what Liston did were 'mistakes' due to his need for speed which clearly got high marks, but saying he was careless due to that speed is anachronistic, which was a frequent occurrence.

As with previous series, Question 1 was the most likely area where most candidates achieved Level 3.

Level 1 was extremely rare and Level 2 was certainly in the minority.

It was also evident that centres are trying to ensure that candidates attempt two different inferences in their answer. There were a number of key points that centres should consider when teaching students how to answer this question effectively.

Some candidates still need to be more explicit with the support they take from the text.

It was clear they had read the source but they had embedded elements of the text in their own writing without crediting the source fully.

For example 'surgeons had to work quickly doing operations in two and half minutes' would be far better expressed as 'surgeons had to work quickly as Source A says they were completed in 'two and a half minutes'.

To gain full credit for an inference, candidates sometimes needed to go beyond just identifying an example and then matching it to a quotation from the source.

A useful framework would be 'I can infer that.....because the Source says.....and this implies that....'

Candidates also need to utilise their literacy skills when deciding upon an inference.

In this series there were frequent references to 'speed' as an inference but as this word was already in the source it was not sufficient to gain full credit.

Candidates should try and take the word and process it, replacing it with an alternative, such as 'Operations had to be done quickly', thus indicating they had the skill of putting things in their own words.

Although this question does not require the use of additional recalled knowledge, candidates need to use their awareness of the historical context.

Understandably many candidates focused on the section with the finger taken off, concluding that this showed operations were dangerous – a good example of the point

above.

However, this was often interpreted as carelessness on the behalf of the surgeon himself. The fact the surgeon was going so quickly was because he was trying to minimise the amount of time he was cutting, thus reducing the amount of pain suffered, and of course the source talks about blood loss which would be affected by the amount of time he was operating. Suggesting the surgeons therefore did not care was misplaced.

So although ARK is not a feature of this question, candidates need to think about the source in context before committing themselves to an inference.

Some candidates attempted to make inferences when in fact their response was based on comprehension.

Many candidates had clearly been taught to make two or three inferences which again should be encouraged if candidates have time to do so as many candidates started their answers with a comprehension point and then went on to make supported inferences. This would not have been the case if candidates had only attempted one inference. The most common comprehension point made was that operations were painful and this is clearly stated in the source.

**Answer ALL questions.**

Look carefully at the background information and Sources A to G in the Sources Booklet and then answer Questions 1 to 5 which follow.

**1 Study Source A.**

What can you learn from Source A about operations in the early nineteenth century?

(6)

I can learn many things from this source about surgery in the early nineteenth century.

Firstly I learn that it was a very painful process. I ~~learn~~ I am told ~~this~~ <sup>this</sup> from the <sup>line</sup> line

"There was no way of completely removing the pain suffered by a patient." This tells me that unlike today's operations which are done with the use of good quality anaesthetics and so no pain is experienced, surgery in the nineteenth century was very painful for patients and they weren't technologically advanced enough to get rid of the pain.

Another thing I learn is that surgery wasn't just a medical procedure in the nineteenth

ceremony, it was also viewed as a performance. There are two parts of the source that tell me this. The first being how history is referred to as a "famous surgeon" shows that being a good surgeon brought fame to your name and earned you a reputation, showing it was almost like a circus act for people living in

these times. I am also given the impression that it was viewed as a performance is how there were people watching; in the source a man is referred to as a 'operator'. This again tells me that surgery was like a show to them. Today the word operator is used in reference to someone at a theatre performance or a sport game, showing people in the nineteenth century considered other people's surgery as their entertainment.

I also learn from this source how terrified people...

• scared of surgery even if not patients undergoing it.

• ~~as~~ A operator reported to have "dropped dead with frights"



### ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This is a good response that gives several clear inferences with good support from the sources.



### ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

Make one inference with support: 5 marks.  
Make two or more inferences with support: 6 marks.  
Do not paraphrase the source details.

## Question 2

Question 2 was generally quite well answered. Particularly impressive were candidates who took the 'art historian' route and analysed the light/dark contrast, the foreground positioning of the ether bottle etc often to very high standards. Themes of it being crowded due to it being a great event of some importance, Liston's teaching of said crowd, and the patient being calm and relaxed were picked up on well.

By far the greatest number of most invalid observations concerned hygiene and infection. It appears that many students were taught about three main problems influencing early surgery, namely pain, blood loss, and hygiene/infection. Many candidates wrote about how, for instance, Liston's not wearing gloves or a mask, or the operating room being crowded with people dressed in normal clothing would mean there was a large risk of infection for the patient, which the artist wanted to emphasise. Of course this is anachronistic, but students attempted to work in germ theory, whilst perhaps not noticing the date on the drawing is 1846, and they should know germ theory did not emerge until the 1860s. It might be advisable for teachers to make the timeline important to students, and emphasise that when doing source analysis, events which happened afterwards are not relevant when trying to extract information from a source purely in isolation. Naturally future events become relevant in other questions, but for individual source analysis it should be emphasised to students that if this is 1846, then Pasteur's research has not happened yet and he bears no relevance to their answer.

This question was a classic example of where reading/understanding the relevance of the provenance was essential with those who did invariably scoring higher marks. This was obvious in comments regarding the spectators. Those who acknowledged the significance of the 'breakthrough'/'incredible discovery' went on to analyse the facial expressions/demeanour etc of the crowd to support the impression. One candidate went as far as to note that there was a man right at the back with his fingers to his ears because he would have been expecting screams from the patient. Those candidates who did not understand the significance of the event, wrote at length about the infection risk that the spectators were creating. These were usually the ones who wrote about the patient needing to be held down as opposed to those who wrote about assistants expecting to have to hold him down. However, there were many candidates who were able to write about the 'tonal contrast', positioning/stance.

A number of candidates however did make it into Level 3 by selecting part of the image and explaining the impression that it creates. In this level, candidates regularly highlighted the facial expressions of the crowd, the pose of Lister or the use of light by the artist. A common point was 'The artist has used light to show the importance of Liston and anaesthetics. In Source B Liston and the bottle of ether have been drawn in white contrasting to the darkness of the rest of the image. This therefore shows their importance.' Or 'The artist has used the facial expressions of the crowd to show the importance of the event. The crowd are all looking directly at Liston and are clearly concentrating on what he is doing.'

### 2 Study Source B.

What impression was the artist trying to give of this operation? Explain your answer, using Source B.

(8)  
Significantly, with the image of the patient being quite large and has got people crowding around it, it appears that the artist is attempting to convey this operation as being one of importance

with people crowding around and observing.

Significantly, in the centre of the image, there is a table where the operation took place. This suggests that it was important because it is the main focus point of the image. This significant feel is also seen as there are lots of men in smart clothes standing around the table as they are seen to be watching what is happening suggesting it is an important event but also a learning opportunity as they are all clearly there to watch what is happening.

Furthermore, as the man performing the operation is the only one wearing pale clothing, he stands out and so we are led to believe that ~~was~~ he is the most important man as he is the one people are watching in action.

In addition, the table containing the ether is unobstructed, left in clear view ~~of the~~ with no-one standing in front. This suggests that it is the thing everyone has come to see as it is special and important and so is able to be seen by everyone.


Ultimately, by having the operation and what is involved with it as the centre of attention, we can suggest that the artist sees this as an important event that people dressed in smart clothing as if it was happening for fun.

or people have come to observe for future purposes as a learning opportunity.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This is a solid Level 3 response that focuses on the impression created by the artist. Focus is on the use of anaesthesia as an important step in the development of surgery. The spectators are witnessing 'a learning opportunity'.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Decide what impression is being made first.  
Use information and details from the source that support the impression given.  
Comment on how the language used/ picture details support the impression.

## Question 3

The best answers could cross-reference precisely. Along with using connectives, these candidates could effectively select precise sections of the sources to cross-reference in responding to the hypothesis. Weaker answers either just went through the sources individually or lacked focus on the question. A lack of connectives was often a common feature of these answers. The majority of candidates did stay focused on the question and made some judgement, using the sources as support, about whether or not Sources C and D suggested operations were safer than those detailed in Source A. However, many responses did not go beyond the top of Level 2 (6 marks) due to a lack of direct cross-referencing between the sources.

Responses that achieved the higher marks within Level 3 were characterised by high quality cross-referencing leading to a balanced judgement in the form of a conclusion, specifically addressing the issue of the extent of support from C and D (as posed by the question 'how far...'). These candidates explored a number of issues and used all three sources together to examine the extent of both support and challenge to the issue of improved safety. For example they used the issue of deaths in Source A and cross-referenced this with Sources C and D to show both support and challenge for improved safety leading to an overall judgement on 'how far' as required by the question.

Extract from Level 3 response:

Source C shows this by stating 'very small number of deaths recorded' in relation to A where the 'assistant', 'patient' and a 'spectator' died. The same goes for Source D which states less 'unexpected accidents' therefore there was less risk of death than in A. Source C however suggests that operations were not completely safe, even in relation to A, as there was still a 'certain amount of risk' whereas D concentrates more on the 'benefits of anaesthetics'. Both C and D suggest operations were safer than in A but D seems to imply the difference in safety is greater than in Source C which still shows the risks of anaesthetics.'

Some candidates who made good cross-references relating to both support and challenge but did not offer a conclusion fully explaining 'how far' achieved 8 marks. Others who cross-referenced the sources and explained elements of support very well but did not fully explore examples of challenge (eg continued problem of deaths in Source C and blood loss in Source D) achieved 7 marks. Very few candidates considered the extent of support and challenge through both content and nature/origin/provenance of the source which was needed for full marks.

Level 2 responses were characterised by taking each source in turn and using the content to make a judgement about whether they suggested operations were safer. Many of these responses only discussed the content of Sources C and D, omitting any direct use of Source A, and therefore achieved a maximum of 5 marks. Others used all three sources but did not make direct cross references and, as a result, could not access Level 3. Some candidates at this level started off well but then drifted onto discussing issues of safety from their own knowledge, losing focus on the question and the specific analysis of Sources A, C and D.

Level 1 responses were either highly generalised (offering an unsupported judgement that operations in Sources C and D were safer than those in Source A) or just paraphrasing some or all of the sources without any reference to the issue of improved safety.

Key points for candidates:

- take the sources together and make direct cross references (rather than dealing with each one in turn)
- explain the ways in which the sources both support and challenge each other
- use explicit examples from the sources to support your points
- make an overall judgement on the extent of support... ie 'how far..'
- assess both content and NOP to reach an overall judgement in relation to the question.

What was noticeable in this series was the increased numbers of students who were gaining access into Level 3 because they were able to demonstrate the skills of cross-referencing.

A good number of candidates limited the marks they could be awarded in the top level because although they did effective cross-referencing they failed to reach a judgement.

As the question asks 'how far' it is demanding they put forward a judgement, but many candidates simply ended their answer without concluding.

All this did not limit them massively in terms of marks awarded, it is implied in the wording of the question and of course the more marks gained.

**3 Study Sources A, C and D.**

How far do Sources C and D suggest that operations were now much safer than those described in Source A? Explain your answer, using these sources.

(10)

It can be seen that sources C and D equally suggest that operations were now much safer than that shown in Source A.

Originally, source A details that there was 'no way of completely removing the pain', suggesting that operations in the early nineteenth century were painful as anaesthetics weren't commonly

used. Whereas, in source D, Hayden describes the patient as being 'relaxed' and also details that she didn't need 'strong men to force her to keep still'. This shows that after the introduction of anaesthetics, operations became much less painful and therefore safer.

Source A denotes that essentially surgeons took more control with their timing than with the overall care of the patient. This is clearly shown with 'during another high speed amputation, Lister cut off the fingers of his assistant'. This suggests that

(Question 3 continued) because surgeons rushed to complete operations accidents were common. Contrasting this, source D conveys that operations with the use of anaesthetic were much safer. The surgeons were then able to 'take his time and calmly go about his work' instead of attempt to carry it out quickly.

In addition to this, both sources C and D have ideas regarding risks and benefits present. Source C suggests that 'chloroform does have a certain amount of risk' (such as overdosage or incorrect administration) but also mentions that in the writer's opinion the number of deaths ~~isn't~~ isn't high enough.

'to stop us making use of the benefits of chloroform'. Similarly, source D credits anaesthetics in the way that 'the surgeon is not forced to hurry by the pain felt by the patient'. Both sources allow us to see that operations are much safer as opposed to that seen in source A which gives the impression that operations were quick, dangerous and messy.

Finally, source D allows us to understand

(Question 3 continued) that blood loss was affected. In source A it details that it was 'not possible to use transfusion to replace blood lost'. This gives the idea that a lot of blood was lost in ~~the~~ early nineteenth century operations and that it was a significant problem. Source D provides information that tools were provided to 'help to stop the flow of blood'. This suggests that blood loss was not as much of a problem as it was before.

To conclude, although both sources C and D suggest that operations were much safer in comparison to source A it's clear that source D provides more information as to the reasons behind the change and the changes after the introduction of anaesthetics whilst

Source C details only details the risks involved with chloroform rather than significant changes to operations.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Comments**

This is a well-argued Level 3 answer that effectively cross-references all three sources to produce a balanced judgement. In doing so the response focuses on content. As such it failed to achieve the maximum marks for the question.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Tip**

Cross-reference between all three sources.

Avoid simply writing what each source shows.

Make use of both the source's content and NOP.

## Question 4

There is growing evidence that candidates are doing better in responses to this question type. Very few candidates simply described the sources or extracted valid details, but failed to explain why these facts would make the source(s) useful to an historian. Of the candidates who offered a judgement regarding utility, most decided that one of the sources would be more useful than the other – a few considered them to be either equally useful or useless. In addition, a small number of candidates seemed to have misunderstood the question focus. Instead of examining the sources for their utility, they discussed which one was the most accurate / most reliable source.

Many candidates missed out on Level 3, as they failed to discuss content and nature for BOTH sources. The majority answered the question based on the content of the two sources with some attempting to 'squeeze' some comments regarding its nature into the conclusion. As far as content is concerned, candidates usually extracted details from the sources illustrating their usefulness to the historian, however, a small minority recognised that there were limitations to the contents of each source.

Candidates who examined the nature of the sources primarily wrote about their reliability. This was usually (and incorrectly) related to either the date of publication or the type of source (textbook vs. drawing). Opinions differed widely with some assuming that the drawing was more reliable because it was painted at the time while others stated the exact opposite. In addition, many presumed that the publication date of the drawing was also the date it was created, incorrectly using the 20-year gap between Hannah Greener's death and the publication date to support their argument regarding reliability.

### **Bias was also a popular aspect of nature.**

Interestingly, this was related to the creators of the sources as well as the contents. Some contemplated that the picture must be biased, as it was drawn by only one person – sometimes referred to as the 'eyewitness' – others stated that the artist had no reason to be biased, as he did not want to promote chloroform. On the other hand, the contents of both sources led some candidates to think that they were biased towards showing the negative effects of anaesthetics. While reliability and bias were addressed by many candidates, only the stronger answers dealt with issues such as the purpose of the source (educational, informative), their representativeness (one case depicted in the drawing vs. public opinion referred to in the textbook), primary vs secondary source.

#### 4 Study Sources E and F.

Which of Sources E or F is more useful to the historian who is enquiring into the use of anaesthetics in operations? Explain your answer, using Sources E and F.

(10)

I think source E would be the most useful to a historian enquiring into the use of anaesthetics in surgery.

I think this because it actually shows anaesthetics being used in surgery and how they are used. The historian can see that the surgeon/surgeons assistant is holding a bottle

of chloroform and a rag. This can tell them that John Snow hadn't invented the chloroform inhaler yet which shows that the use of chloroform in operations was relatively new and had quite a high success rate if Hannah Green's death was that important for an artist to paint. Also, the historian can see that anaesthetics were used even in quite minor surgery i.e. the removal of a toenail which shows them that chloroform was used regularly and effectively in all types of operations.

(Question 4 continued) The reliability of this source is also good as it was drawn around about the time of ~~surgery~~<sup>chloroform</sup> being ~~first~~ used in surgery and can give you a very accurate detail of what was going on and what was being used, and for what purpose. However, because it's a painting it is the artist's interpretation of the events and some of it might not be 100% correct or reliable. Also it's painted quite a few years after the event therefore some parts might be forgotten or remembered wrong, or could be biased depending on the view of that period of time.

Source F mainly talks about the opposition towards anaesthetics not generally their use in surgery. It talks about the disadvantages of ether i.e. could damage lungs, cause

irritation, vomiting, death etc. This could be useful to a historian but it doesn't really show its use in surgery but it does show its

(Question 4 continued) usefulness. It does go on to talk about the use of anaesthetics in childbirth which could be useful but then goes on to talk about its opposition from religion and how pain is sent by God to accompany childbirth.

Source F, however, is more reliable than source E as even though it is written in modern times and is a secondary source it was written for educational purposes not to persuade. ~~or anything~~ He isn't trying to force his agenda or opinion onto anybody it is merely for educational purposes. Also, he will have researched ~~at~~ a lot and looked at all the facts/figures and sources from around that period so the detail should be incredibly accurate.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This response successfully combines comments on both content and nature to produce a logical judgement of relative utility. This is a Level 3 answer.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Make use of both content and Nature Origin and Purpose of each source.

Sources that are nearer the event are not necessarily more useful or reliable.

Avoid simple comments about primary and secondary being better or worse.

## **Question 5**

Question 5 produced some solid responses that made effective use of the sources and additional recalled knowledge (ARK).

The vast majority of answers used the sources and selected relevant content in order to support their answers. A typical answer at Level 2 went through the content of two or three of the sources without a significant reference to the statement; 'Source E shows an operation taking place using chloroform.....Source F comments on the success of anaesthetics by saying 'we have conquered pain'....Source G shows how chloroform was administered.' Some answers at Level 2 used a range of own knowledge and clearly linked to the statement; however their failure to use any of the sources prevented them from achieving Level 3 or 4.

A typical answer at Level 3 used the sources excellently to support or contrast against the statement eg Source F agrees with the statement and suggests anaesthetics were opposed for religious reasons. It says: 'According to the Bible.....'

A number of answers were pegged at Level 3 simply because there was not enough evidence of additional recall knowledge. These answers used the sources well to support the statement and also highlight other reasons for opposition such as that a patient died (Source E) or the side effects of anaesthetics (Source F) and the dangers of ether.

When ARK was used, regular comments included the invention an inhaler for chloroform by John Snow or that Queen Victoria used chloroform to give birth and therefore this would increase acceptance of the use of anaesthetics. Some candidates commented on the reluctance of the army to use anaesthetics as well as giving examples of other problems with ether such as having to carry it around in heavy containers.

Some candidates did score Level 4 by presenting a balanced argument, highlighting that people did oppose anaesthetics because of religious beliefs (as shown in Source F), but also due to other reasons that are listed above. At Level 4 there was an increase in candidates attempting to consider the value of the sources eg 'Source E is a drawing and therefore this could be an impression that the artist is trying to convey.' However very few responses considered how the value of the type of information affected their overall judgement. When value was considered, it appeared to be an 'add on' to their answer and this gave the impression of a taught technique response.

Overall candidates coped with this question well having more scored 10 marks than in previous examination series simply because there was no use of ARK. ARK is knowledge that is not contained in any of the sources used and not just in those mentioned in the question.

Nearly all candidates attempted this question. This suggests that candidates are progressing in time management or are leaving out other questions in the knowledge that Question 5 is worth 19 marks. The best answers addressed the question and considered both sides of the debate and used the sources, although more could use sources other than the 3 in the question, and ARK to build a better answer. It is refreshing to see candidates confident enough to disagree and support their answer. Teachers need to be encouraged to ensure that students include clear ARK to open up top Level 3 and Level 4. Although there are marks for strength of evidence a number of students seemed to feel they should explain the reliability of every source even when it was not really relevant at that point. It not only breaks up the progress of their answer and it makes their responses less focused on the question set.

**\*5 Study Sources E, F and G and use your own knowledge.**

**Spelling, punctuation and grammar will be assessed in this question.**

'Religious belief was the main reason why there was so much opposition to the use of anaesthetics.'

How far do you agree with this statement? Use your own knowledge, Sources E, F and G and any other sources you find helpful to explain your answer.

(16)

Source F agrees with the statement that 'Religious belief was the main reason why there was so much opposition to the use of anaesthetics.' It says 'According to the Bible, God had said childbirth would be accompanied by pain.' This shows that many people opposed to the use of anaesthetics because they believed that this was going against God's will, and God wants women to go through pain whilst giving birth. From my own knowledge, I know that in 1847, when Simpson used chloroform as an anaesthetic, many people resented to use it because they believed they were disobeying God if they did so.

Source F is both reliable and unreliable. Source F is reliable as it is a secondary source and is from a history textbook. This means that the source should be based on detailed research from primary sources to put events in context and because it is from a history book, should mean that it is written to educate and not persuade. This can also be seen by the fact that the source does not use loaded language. However, Source F could also be unreliable

as because it is a secondary source, it may not have been based on detailed ~~own~~ research from primary sources and may have missed out details in order for the historian to prove a hypothesis.

Sources E, F and G all disagree with the statement that 'religious beliefs' was the main reason why there was so much opposition to the use of anaesthetics' and ~~also~~ discuss other factors that led to the opposition to the use of anaesthetics: Source E shows the death of Hannah Greeney whilst receiving chloroform and has no reference to ~~any~~ <sup>religious</sup> reasons of opposition to chloroform. From my own knowledge, I know that Hannah Greeney died because she was given too large of an amount of chloroform. I also know that ~~despite~~ until the discovery of the chloroform inhaler by Snow in 1848, the dosage of chloroform ~~was~~ <sup>was</sup> led to the death of many people as if too less was given, patients still felt pain, and if too much was given they died. Source F agrees that religious beliefs was not the main reason why there was opposition to anaesthetics as it says 'medical opposition' and 'ether could damage the lungs'. This shows that people ~~opposed~~ <sup>opposed</sup> to anaesthetics based on scientific knowledge as they saw that they could harm people i.e.g. ether damaged the lungs. From my own knowledge, I know that ether

had many drawbacks, such as making patients vomit and irritating their throats. I also know that people ~~opposed~~ <sup>opposed</sup> to anaesthetics such as ether and chloroform due to other reasons such as the fact that ~~they~~ <sup>their</sup> ~~same~~ effects were not fully understood ~~such~~ <sup>such</sup> as well as <sup>people having strong</sup> religious beliefs against the use of them. Source G also agrees ~~with this~~ <sup>with this</sup> that religious beliefs was not the main reason ~~as for opposition~~ <sup>as for opposition</sup> against anaesthetics as it says 'incorrect

'administration of it' This shows that people opposed to the use of chloroform as an anaesthetic as surgeons were not using it properly. From my own knowledge, I know that the only despite being an effective anaesthetic, the correct dosage of chloroform was not known until 1848 due to John Snow. The source also says 'careless manner'. This agrees with the fact that a reason why people opposed to anaesthetics such as chloroform was because surgeons did not use it properly. ~~From my own knowledge, I also know that other reasons, including careless use and from surgeons who did not fully understand anaesthetics, people for the opposition towards anaesthetics were included the fact that some military surgeons~~



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Comments**

This is a solid Level 4 response that produces a sustained argument, making effective use of both sources and additional recalled knowledge (ARK).

## Paper Summary

Based on their performance in this paper, candidates are offered the following advice:

- plan to use your time well, spend longer on high mark questions
- answer all 5 questions
- make two or more inferences on Question 1 and support them by using the source
- decide what the impression/message is in Question 2 before answering the question
- cross reference the three sources in Question 3 and comment on content and NOP
- use both sources using both content and NOP.

## Grade Boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/iwantto/Pages/grade-boundaries.aspx>

Ofqual



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru  
Welsh Assembly Government



Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828  
with its registered office at Edinburgh Gate, Harlow, Essex CM20 2JE